

Minutes of the Meeting of the PLANNING COMMITTEE held on 12 May 2021

PRESENT -

Councillor Clive Woodbridge (Chair); Councillor Monica Coleman (Vice-Chair); Councillors Alex Coley, Nigel Collin (as nominated substitute for Councillor Peter O'Donovan), Neil Dallen, David Gulland (Present for Item 3 only due to conflict of interest), Previn Jagutpal, Colin Keane, Jan Mason, Steven McCormick, Lucie McIntyre (Attended during the middle of the presentation for Item 2, therefore was unable to vote on this Item), Debbie Monksfield and Clive Smitheram

Absent: Councillor Peter O'Donovan

Officers present: Amardip Healy (Chief Legal Officer), Viv Evans (Interim Head of Planning), Virginia Johnson (Planner), Mehdi Rezaie (Interim Planning Development Manager), Sarah Keeble (Democratic Services Officer) and Tim Richardson (Committee Administrator)

51 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following declarations were made in relation to Items of business to be discussed at the meeting:

In the interests of openness and transparency, Councillor Clive Woodbridge declared on behalf of all Members that all Members had received a number of correspondence from both Applicants and objectors regarding Items 2 and 3, and that this correspondence had not affected any judgement.

In the interests of openness and transparency, Councillor Neil Dallen declared that he is a member of Epsom Civic Society and Epsom Town Residents Association. Councillor Dallen stated that he came to the meeting with a clear and open mind.

In the interests of openness and transparency, Councillor Previn Jagutpal declared that he is a member of Woodcote Epsom Residents Association. Councillor Jagutpal stated that he came to the meeting with a clear and open mind.

In the interests of openness and transparency, Councillor Steven McCormick declared that he is a member of Epsom Civic Society, Woodcote Epsom Residents Society and the Epsom and Ewell Tree Advisory Board. Councillor McCormick stated that he came to the meeting with a clear and open mind.

Epsom General Hospital, Dorking Road, Epsom, Surrey, KT18 7EG

In the interests of openness and transparency, Councillor David Gulland declared that he is a Trustee and Secretary of the Claude Thompson Charitable Trust, which owns the land next to the site of the proposed development in Item 2. Given the potential impact of the Application on the value and use of this land, and the potential for conflicts of interest, Councillor Gulland did not take part in this Agenda Item.

In the interests of openness and transparency, Councillor Nigel Collin declared that he has used the hospital car park on several occasions, and although he has found it difficult to park, came to the meeting with an open mind.

52 EPSOM GENERAL HOSPITAL, DORKING ROAD, EPSOM, SURREY, KT18 7EG

Description

Erection of a multi storey car park comprising ground plus 5 storeys and 527 car parking spaces, reconfiguration of surface parking to provide 104 car parking spaces and improvement to the access road from Dorking Road.

Decision

The Committee received a presentation from the Planning Officer, who noted the publications of the Update Report and Addendum which were published in advance of the meeting.

The Committee was addressed by Ward Member, Councillor Liz Frost, who spoke in objection to the Application. The Committee also heard from a representative from Epsom Civic Society, who also spoke in objection to the Application.

The following matters were raised by the Committee:

- a) Height and massing:** Members raised concerns regarding the height, mass, scale and design of the proposed scheme. Members noted the size and scale of the proposal and its materials and spoke about whether it would adversely impact the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
- b) Impact on Heritage Assets:** Members raised concerns regarding the impact that the proposal may have on the surrounding Heritage Assets, including the neighbouring boundary of Woodcote Conservation Area. The Officer noted that the public benefits that would arise from the scheme being approved were considered to outweigh any adverse impacts of the proposal.
- c) Disabled parking provision:** Members noted the 14 proposed disabled parking spaces, and the distribution of this provision across all storeys. The Officer noted that a condition seeking alternative provision for surface-level spaces may be sought if Members so wished.

- d) **Green Agenda:** Members highlighted the importance of proposals being eco-friendly. The Officer noted that the proposed scheme incorporated bio-diversity enhancements, green walls and electric-charging points.
- e) **Access from Dorking Road:** Members raised concerns regarding the traffic flow and access from the adjacent Dorking Road. Officers noted that the Applicant has worked with Surrey County Council Highways and that they have no objections to the proposed development.

The Committee took a vote based on the Officer's recommendation, which was to approve Planning permission. Following consideration, the Committee resolved with 6 Members voting against, 4 Members voting for, and the Chair not voting that:

Planning Permission is **NOT GRANTED**.

The Committee then moved the vote to refuse the Application.

The reasons for this refusal were as follows:

- The proposed development, by reasons of its height, mass, scale and poor design (including its roof form, and choice of specified materials), would adversely impact and harm the character and appearance of the area, failing to comply with Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy (2007), Policies DM9, DM10 and DM11 of the Development Management Policies Document (2015) and paragraphs 2, 122 and 127 of the NPPF (2019).
- The proposed development, by reasons of its height, mass, scale and poor design (including its roof form, and choice of specified materials), would fail to preserve or enhance the character or setting of the adjacent Woodcote Conservation Area, failing to comply with Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy (2007), Policies DM8 and DM9 of the Development Management Policies Document (2015) and paragraphs 2, 193, 196 and 202 of the NPPF (2019).

The Committee resolved, with 6 Members voting for, 4 Members voting against and the Chair not voting that:

The Application be **REFUSED** based on reasons highlighted by the Committee, including concerns surrounding:

- Mass, scale and height of building
- Heritage assets and the impact of the neighbouring Conservation Area

53 DEVELOPMENT SITE AT 24-28 WEST STREET, EPSOM, SURREY**Description**

Demolition of existing building and construction of a new part 7 and part 8 storey building containing ground floor commercial/retail (E use class) and 25 residential units (C3 Use) on upper levels and associated development.

Decision

The Committee received a presentation from the Planning Development Officer.

The Committee noted a written objection from the Chair of Epsom Civic Society, which was read out by the Monitoring Officer following connection issues. The Committee was addressed by the Agent to the Applicant.

The following matters were raised by the Committee:

- a) **Parking provision:** Members raised concerns regarding the provision of parking spaces. It was confirmed by the Officer that there would be vehicular parking provided on site. The site would, however, incorporate a number of cycle spaces. It was noted that discussions with Surrey County Councils Highways had been undertaken and they had raised no concerns with this aspect of the scheme.
- b) **Arrangements for refuse collection:** Members raised concerns with the proposed lay-by for refuse-collection vehicles to frequent. The Officer noted that the Waste Services Department had been consulted and were satisfied with the arrangements for refuse collection throughout the proposed scheme.
- c) **Height, design and scale:** Members noted that the proposed development would be the tallest building in Epsom town. Members noted the size and scale of the proposal and spoke about whether it would adversely impact the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
- d) **Affordable housing:** Members noted the need for affordable housing within the Borough. Following a question from a Member, the Officer confirmed that potential occupants would be assessed against a set of criteria which they must fit in order to be considered to purchase the affordable units.
- e) **Amenity space:** Members noted the revised layout of the proposed balconies. The Officer noted that these balconies would not affect any external elevations, and that the proposed scheme maintained internal and external amenity areas.

The Head of Planning recommended that the Committee propose this Application be deferred, to allow Officers to re-present to the Committee once more information had been obtained regarding:

- Affordable housing
- Design (Secured by Design)
- Height/Mass/Density
- Amenity space
- Arrangement for refuse collection
- Various matters of factual classification, including the amount, type and location of landscaping measures; the location of cycle store facilities; and arrangements for the car club vehicle.

Following consideration, the Committee resolved with 10 Members voting for, 2 Members voting against and the Chair not voting that:

The Application be **DEFERRED** and brought back to the Committee once the Officer had obtained more information.

The meeting began at 7.30 pm and ended at 10.32 pm

COUNCILLOR CLIVE WOODBRIDGE (CHAIR)

This page is intentionally left blank